UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/886,162	06/21/2001	John Mark Hartel	AUS920010056US1	5976

35525 7590 06/13/2005

IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER	
WU, YICUN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2165	

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/886,162	HARTEL, JOHN MARK	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Yicun Wu	2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 April 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-59* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-59* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

5.20'

III. DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-59 are presented for examination.

2. Applicant's arguments submitted on 4-18-2005 with respect to claims 1-59 have been reconsidered but are not deemed persuasive for the reasons set forth below.

Response to Applicant's Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walsh et al. (U.S. Patent 6,810,429) in view of Miller et al. (U.S. Patent 6,661,437).

As to Claims 1, 24, 39 and 57, Walsh et al. discloses a method in a data processing system for transferring data, the method comprising:

receiving data (i.e. add. Col. 6, lines 40-46) describing objects (i.e. document. Col. 6, lines 40-46) in an original format, wherein the original format is unusable by a set of processing environments (col. 4, lines 37-40);

storing the data in a database format in a database (i.e. data source. Col. 6, lines 40-46);

responsive to receiving a request (i.e. query. Col. 6, lines 4-24) for an object (i.e. document. Col. 6, lines 4-24) from a particular processing environment within the set of processing environments (i.e. add. Col. 6, lines 40-46) ,

retrieving data corresponding to the object from the database (i.e. a relational database. Col. 6, lines 25-29); and

translating the data corresponding to the object into a selected format usable by the particular processing environment (i.e. in the form of a XML document Col. 6, lines 4-24).

5. Walsh et al. does not explicitly teach the data comprises a graphical user interface object hierarchy comprising a sequence of functional units for execution in a graphical user interface.

Miller et al. teaches the data comprises a graphical user interface object hierarchy comprising a sequence of functional units for execution in a graphical user interface Miller et al. (Col. 1, lines 34-40 and col. 2, lines 32-47).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Walsh et al. with the data comprises a graphical user interface object hierarchy comprising a sequence of functional units for execution in a graphical user interface.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Walsh et al. by the teaching of Miller et al. because providing the data comprises a graphical user interface object hierarchy comprising a sequence of functional units for execution in a graphical user interface allows a simpler command interface suitable for the general public whilst providing supports complex User interactive tasks as taught by Miller et al. (col. 1, lines 23-28).

As to Claims 2 and 40, Walsh et al. as modified teaches a method wherein

the object contains a functional unit presented as an action to a user in the particular processing environment via a graphical user interface console (Miller et al. Col. 1, lines 34-40 and col. 2, lines 32-47), wherein the action has a same look and feel for each of the set of procession environments. Miller et al. (col. 2, lines 32-67).

As to Claims 3 and 41, Walsh et al. as modified teaches a method wherein

the database format is a set of entries in a table (i.e. data format. Walsh et al. Col. 4, lines 36-41), and

wherein the database format corresponds to information obtained from the graphical user interface hierarchy (Miller et al. Col. 1, lines 34-40 and col. 2, lines 32-47).

As to Claims 4 and 42, Walsh et al. as modified teaches a method wherein

the data describes relationship between an instance of an action object and an instance of a functional unit definition object (Walsh et al. Col. 5, line 14-50).

As to Claims 5 and 43, Walsh et al. as modified teaches a method wherein

the processing environment is a Java processing environment (i.e. Java servlets java applets. Walsh et al. Col.7, lines 5-15) and the form is a Java class (i.e. Java servlets java applets. Walsh et al. Col.7, lines 5-15).

As to Claims 6, 29, 44 and 58, Walsh et al. as modified

teaches a method in a data processing system for transferring data, the method comprising:

receiving a markup language file (i.e. XML. Col. 10, lines 59-67) describing at least one object (i.e. document. Walsh et al. Col. 6, lines 40-46) in an original format, wherein the original format is unusable by a set of processing environments, and wherein the data comprises a graphical user interface object hierarchy comprising a sequence of functional units for execution in a graphical user interface Miller et al. (Col. 1, lines 34-40 and col. 2, lines 32-47);

converting the markup language file to at least one table in a database (Walsh et al. Col. 10, lines 59-67), wherein the at least one table (i.e. table. Walsh et al. col. 10, lines 59-67) contains object parameters for the at least one object (Walsh et al. col. 10, lines 59-67);

responsive to a request for an object from a particular requestor within the set of requestors, translating the at least one table into the object (i.e. in the form of a XML document. Walsh et al. Col. 6, lines 4-24) into a selected format usable by the particular requestor; and

sending the object to the particular requestor (Walsh et al. Col. 6, lines 4-24).

As to Claims 7 and 45 Walsh et al. as modified teaches a method comprising:

validating the markup language file using a document type definition file (i.e. DTD. Walsh et al. Col. 10, lines 59-67) prior to the converting the markup language file (i.e. as defined by the DTDs. Walsh et al. Col. 10, lines 59-67).

As to Claims 8 and 46, Walsh et al. as modified teaches a method wherein

the request for the object is for an object in a desired form selected among a plurality of available object forms and wherein the translating step translates the table into the desired object form (i.e. DOM document object. Walsh et al. col. 6, lines 5-24).

As to Claims 9 and 47, Walsh et al. as modified teaches a method wherein

the object is a graphical user interface object used for representing a system resource in a graphical user interface (i.e. user interface. Walsh et al. col. 9, lines 53-55).

As to Claims 10, 34, 48 and 59, Walsh et al. as modified

teaches a method in a data processing system, the method comprising:

storing external customizable data (i.e. XML. Walsh et al. Col. 10, lines 59-67) for use by a set of software systems during execution of processes by the software system in a central repository (i.e. database. Walsh et al. Col. 6, lines 59-67);

wherein the set of software system are distributed within a network data processing system (fig. 1b); and

delivering the external customizable data in a selected format (i.e. XML. Walsh et al. Col. 10, lines 59-67) usable by a particular software system in the set of software systems in response to requests from the particular software system (i.e. query. Walsh et al. Col. 6, lines 5-24).

As to Claims 11 and 49, Walsh et al. as modified teaches a method wherein

the external customizable data is an extensible markup language data file (i.e. XML. Walsh et al. Col. 10, lines 59-67).

As to Claims 12 and 50, Walsh et al. as modified teaches a method wherein

the object is an instance of a Java class (i.e. Java servlets java applets. Walsh et al. Col.7, lines 5-15).

As to Claims 13 and 51, Walsh et al. as modified teaches a method wherein

the requestor is a data proxy (i.e. agents. Walsh et al. Col. 5, line 14).

As to Claims 14 and 52, Walsh et al. as modified teaches a method wherein

the object is a Java class (i.e. Java servlets java applets. Walsh et al. Col.7, lines 5-15).

As to Claim 15, Walsh et al. as modified teaches a method wherein

the object is an instance of a Java object (i.e. Java servlets java applets. Walsh et al. Col.7, lines 5-15).

As to Claims 16 and 53, Walsh et al. as modified teaches a method wherein the step of sending the object to the requestor comprises:

sending a universal resource identifier to the requestor (i.e. URL. Col 12, lines 20-32).

As to Claims 17 and 54, Walsh et al. as modified teaches a method wherein the external customizable data is a markup language file and further comprising:

validating the markup language file (i.e. as defined by the DTDs. Walsh et al. Col. 10, lines 59-67).

As to Claim 18 and 55, Walsh et al. as modified teaches a method wherein

the markup language file is an extensible markup language file (i.e. XML. Walsh et al. Col. 10, lines 59-67).

As to Claim 19 and 56, Walsh et al. as modified teaches a method wherein

the extensible markup language file is validated using a document type definition file (i.e. as defined by the DTDs. Walsh et al. Col. 10, lines 59-67).

As to Claim 20, Walsh et al. as modified teaches a system, the system comprising:

a database (i.e. data source. Walsh et al. col. 6, lines 5-24),

wherein the database contains representations of objects (i.e. document. Walsh et al. col. 6, lines 5-24);

a data import process (i.e. add. Walsh et al. col. 6, lines 40-46),

wherein the data import process receives an external data file describing an object (i.e. add. Walsh et al. col. 6, lines 40-46) in an original format, wherein the original format is unusable by a set of processing environments, and wherein the data comprises a graphical user interface object hierarchy comprising a sequence of functional units for execution in a graphical user interface Miller et al. (Col. 1, lines 34-40 and col. 2, lines 32-47);

translates external data file into a representation, and

stores the representation in the database (Walsh et al. col. 10, lines 15-20),

a data server process, wherein the data server process receives a request from a particular requestor (i.e. a query. Walsh et al. Col. 10, lines 5-20) in the set of requestors,

fetches a selected representation in response to receiving the request (i.e. a query. Walsh et al. Col. 10, lines 5-20),

translates the selected representation into an object into a selected format usable the particular requestor (i.e. XML format. Walsh et al. Col. 10, lines 5-20), and

sends the object to the particular requestor (Walsh et al. Col. 10, lines 5-20).

As to Claim 21, Walsh et al. as modified teaches a system, comprising:

a set of data proxies (i.e. agents. Walsh et al. Col. 5, line 14), wherein a data proxy within the set of data proxies connects to the data server process (Walsh et al. Fig. 1b, item 101),

receives a request from a local processing environment(i.e. agents. Walsh et al. Col. 5, line 14),

routes the request to the data server (Walsh et al. Fig. 1b, item 101), receives a result from the data server process (Walsh et al. Fig. 1b, item 101), and

sends the result to the local processing environment (Walsh et al. Fig. 1b, item 101 and col. 10, line 10).

As to Claim 22, Walsh et al. as modified teaches a system, wherein

the external data file is a markup language file (i.e. XML. Walsh et al. Col. 10, lines 59-67).

As to Claim 23, Walsh et al. as modified teaches a system, wherein

the markup language file is an extensible markup language file (i.e. XML. Walsh et al. Col. 10, lines 59-67).

As to Claims 25, 30 and 35, Walsh et al. as modified teaches a data processing system comprising

the bus system includes a primary bus and a secondary bus (Walsh et al. fig. 1b).

As to Claims 26, 31 and 36, Walsh et al. as modified teaches a data processing system comprising:

the processor unit includes a single processor (Walsh et al. fig. 1b).

As to Claims 27, 32 and 37, Walsh et al. as modified teaches a data processing system comprising,

the processor unit includes a plurality of processors (Walsh et al. fig. 1b).

As to Claims 28, 33 and 38, Walsh et al. as modified teaches a data processing system wherein

the communications unit is an Ethernet adapter (Walsh et al. fig. 1b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated over Burkett et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,678,889).

As to Claim 1, Burkett et al. discloses a method in a data processing system for transferring data, the method comprising:

receiving data describing objects in an original format (i.e. original. Col. 2, lines 1-20), wherein the original format is unusable by a set of processing environments (Col. 2, lines 1-20), and wherein the data comprises a graphical user interface (i.e. GUI. Col 1, lines 57-67) object hierarchy comprising a sequence of functional units for execution in a graphical user interface (i.e. GUI. Col 1, lines 57-67);

storing the data in a database format in a database (i.e. stored. Col. 4, lines 1-15) and (i.e. resource. Col. 7, lines 48-67);

responsive to receiving a request for an object from a particular processing environment within the set of processing environments (i.e. request. Col. 7, lines 48-67),

retrieving data corresponding to the object from the database (Col. 7, lines 48-67); and

translating the data corresponding to the object into a selected format usable by the particular processing environment (i.e. translated. Col. 9, lines 1-34).

As to Claim 2, Burkett et al. discloses a method wherein

the object contains a functional unit presented as an action to a user in the particular processing environment via a graphical user interface console, wherein the action has a same look and feel for each of the set of procession environments (i.e. have a common look and feel. Col. 9, lines 1-34).

As to Claim 3, Burkett et al. discloses a method wherein

the database format is a set of entries in a table (i.e. resource. Col. 7, lines 48-67), and

wherein the database format corresponds to information obtained from the graphical user interface hierarchy (Col. 7, lines 48-67).

As to Claim 4, Burkett et al. discloses a method wherein the data describes relationship between an instance of an action object and an instance of a functional unit definition object (Col. 7, lines 48-67).

As to Claim 5, Burkett et al. discloses a method wherein the processing environment is a Java processing environment and the form is a Java class (i.e. Java. Col. 4, lines 46-67).

8. As to claims 6-59, the limitations have been discussed above, and are similarly rejected.

Response to Applicant' Remarks

9. Examiner has completed a through study of Applicant's amendment of 4-18-2005.

10. Especially, Applicant's amendments to claims 1-59 and remarks at pages 4-9 of the Amendment of 4-18-2005 has been carefully studied and reviewed.

11. Applicant's amendments to claims 1-59 further direct the claimed invention into.

12. Examiner has carefully and thoroughly studied and reviewed Applicant's amendment of 4-18-2005. Examiner asserts that Walsh et al. in combination with Miller et al. teaches Applicant's claimed invention of a method in a data processing system for transferring data.

In addition, the specially discussed feature of the claimed invention ("the data comprises a graphical user interface object hierarchy comprising a sequence of functional units for execution in a graphical user interface") is very clearly discussed in Miller et al. (Col. 1, lines 34-40 and col. 2, lines 32-47).

13. Applicant is inaccurate for the reasons explicitly stated in the first Office Action. Examiner asserts that Walsh et al. in combination with Miller et al. teaches Applicant's claimed invention of a method in a data processing system for transferring data.

Conclusion

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**, Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this office action. Accordingly, *THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP 706.07(a)*. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory- period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply-expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Points of contact

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yicun Wu whose telephone number is 571-272-4087. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 4:30 pm, Monday -Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 571-272-4083. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Yicun Wu
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100

CHARLES RONES
PRIMARY EXAMINER

June 5, 2005